

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

Date of mailing

(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
see form PCT/ISA/220

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/US2005/028605

International filing date (day/month/year)
10.08.2005

Priority date (day/month/year)
30.09.2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
H04L29/06, G06F21/00

Applicant
CITRIX SYSTEMS, INC.

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☒ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office - Gitschiner Str. 103
D-10958 Berlin
Tel. +49 30 25901 - 0
Fax: +49 30 25901 - 840

Authorized Officer

Figiel, B

Telephone No. +49 30 25901-473



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/US2005/028605

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
 - ☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
 - ☐ a sequence listing
 - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
 - ☐ in written format
 - ☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
 - ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
 - ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/US2005/028605

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-45
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-45
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-45
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

see separate sheet

1. The following documents (D) are referred to in this communication; the numbering will be adhered to in the rest of the procedure:

D1: WO 02/37267 A (SUN MICROSYSTEMS, INC) 10 May 2002 (2002-05-10)

D2: WO 02/23362 A (NETMOTION WIRELESS, INC; HANSON, AARON, D;
STURNIOLO, EMIL, A; MENN, A) 21 March 2002 (2002-03-21)

D3: EP-A-1 047 239 (FUJITSU LIMITED) 25 October 2000 (2000-10-25)

Certain observations on the international application (clarity) (VIII)

2. The application does not meet the requirements of **Article 6 PCT**, because the subject-matter of a plurality of the claims is not clear:

2.1 Clarity objections to **claim 1**:

- It is not clear **to which term the expression "in response to"** (line 12) **refers**: "*establishing...in response to*" or "*identified in response to*". This leaves the reader in doubt as to the meaning of the technical features to which it refers, thereby rendering the definition of the subject-matter of said claims unclear. For the assessment of the novelty of the claim the term "*establishing...in response to*" was used for the interpretation.
- It is unclear which entity performs the steps of "*identifying*".
- Article 6 PCT requires that claims should be clear in themselves, without there being any need for the skilled person to refer to the description. The features that first "*identifying .. sessions already associated*" and then "*establishing.. a connection between a client computer .. and the.. application sessions*" leaves the reader in doubt as to the meaning of the technical features to which it refers. It should be clear that it concerns an additional session (see claim 9) or a disconnected session (see also claim 13) from the past.

2.2 Clarity objections to **claims 3-17**:

- There are no references (a) .. (f) in claim 1, so the use of such references in claims 3-17 is not allowable, as it leaves the reader in doubt as to the steps which are meant.

2.3 Clarity objection to claim 18:

- The terms "*application sessions was connected ... prior to connection*" is not clear and leaves the reader in doubt as to the meaning of the technical features to which it refers, thereby rendering the definition of the subject-matter of said claim unclear.

2.4 Clarity objection to claim 23:

- The term "*providing for receiving application output*" has no clear technical meaning thus leaves the reader in doubt as to the meaning of the technical features to which it refers.

Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) (V)

3. Notwithstanding the above-mentioned lack of clarity, the present application does not meet the requirements of Articles 33(1)-(2) PCT, because the subject-matter of **independent claims 1 and 30 is not new.**

- 3.1 Referring to the wording of **claim 1** document D1 (the references in parentheses applying to this document) discloses:

a method for providing authorized remote access to one or more application sessions, the method comprising:

- requesting, by a client node, access to a resource (page 15, lines 9-12);
- gathering, by a collection agent, information about the client node (page 15, lines 21-23);
- receiving, by a policy engine, the gathered information (page 16, lines 3-13);
- making, by a policy engine, an access control decision based on the received information (page 16, lines 11-12);
- identifying one or more application sessions already associated with the user in response to the received information (page 16, lines 16-21; page 18, line 20 -

- page 19, line 2; page 19, lines 24-25) and
- establishing, by a session server, a connection between a client computer operated by the user and the one or more application sessions identified in response to the received information (page 17, lines 9-12).

The subject-matter of claim 1 is therefore not new.

- 3.2 The subject-matter of claim 1 is also not new over the disclosure of the documents D2 and D3. See citation in International Search Report.
- 3.3 Independent **claim 30** contain the same features as a method of claim 1 expressed respectively in terms of a system.
Therefore, the above arguments with respect to novelty of claim 1 similarly apply to this claim. Consequently, the subject matter of this claim is also not new.
4. **Dependent claims 2-29 and 31-45** do not contain any additional features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the Article 33(1) PCT in respect of novelty (Article 33(2) PCT) and/or inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT) for the reason that the subject-matter of said claims is either in principle directly derivable from the disclosure of the documents D1-D3 or represents simple design details which are generally known to the person skilled in the field.

Particularly with regard to the following claims:

- 4.1 Claims 9, 14, 26, 41: a rule permitting the client computer operated by the user to connect to the one or more application sessions - see document D1, page 19, lines 12-13.
- 4.2 Claims 13, 40: the step of continuing, by the session server, execution of at least one of the disconnected application sessions - see document D2, page 4, lines 11-22.
- 4.3 Claims 18-19, 28-29, 42-43: reconnection to the same or other terminal - see document D2, lines 13-14; page 35, lines 9-12.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING
AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)**

International application No.

PCT/US2005/028605